

## To Whom It May Concern:



I truly wish to thank you for your support in this most trying time of the employees of the former Exxon refinery in Benicia, Ca. It is impressive what we together have accomplished in trying to bring about fair treatment of the Benicia employees during this divestiture. Every person I work with is happy with the progress so far but we still have some concerns that will have to be satisfied before we can completely embrace our new owners. Listed below, in no set order, are the items I feel most strongly about:

For the 32 years I have worked for Exxon in Benicia as a technician I have been told that we receive premium pay because of our many skills and willingness to work many units. We as a group complained about the minimal premium, but always went along with management telling us that they would continue to look into the matter. We have been called naive by the media for our trust in what our managers have told us but never the less remained hopeful. When Mr. Daigle was asked why Benicia employees are not being treated as employees at other Exxon sites with respect to a severance his reply was, "The other sites were paid severance because it was contractual. We have paid you a premium salary to keep you non-union". It is appalling to me to have the fact that we had trust in our management (naive) spit in our face, especially since we have been told for so long that our premium pay was for our multiskills. Mr. Daigle all but challenged us to go union if we didn't like our treatment, as if he would care now. We have lost many valuable employees since November 30th. We stand to lose many more during the next year if something is not done to help. There is a real-life safety problem here, with so much experience leaving what to some is a sinking ship. Many of us old-timers are very concerned about the experience level in the refinery. I would suggest an Exxon financed retention plan something like: 20% increase above base pay the first year, lowered to 15% the second year, 10% the third year and 5% the forth year. Normal pay increases would still be given each year, the retention would be above the increase.

I do not understand how or why one group of employees would be guaranteed five years employment and another group cannot. It is nice to try to divide us so one group feels satisfied but the group is offended at this ploy. Why can't the new employer guarantee employment to everyone as long as they fill their job description? If Valero really wants happy employees, why leave such uncertainty?

Again, I don't understand the problem with the lump sum matter. Why is it a problem to pay a lump sum? It is just giving the employee at retirement what they have earned all at once. Why is it so important to the employer to hold our money? Does it give them a feeling of continued power over the retiree?

We still haven't got a definitive answer about the "hostages" in Benicia. Will they have the opportunity to return to their home base job? If not, why not?

I believe a new company coming in will first look for cost cutting plans. Our shift schedule is something that is appealing to most employees. We would like a guarantee that it will not be changed without the agreement of a majority of the people who work shift-work.

We have 30 days to comment on the sale. ExxonMobil has given us a rough outline of what they say we can expect from them. ExxonMobil has also told us that a written detailed document won't be available for 2 to 3 months. That is completely unacceptable. As mentioned in paragraph two, I think we have been naive long enough. How can we comment on something we don't have in writing, except for the rough outline? Trust has been lost and will take time to rebuild. For now promises will be accepted only if they are in writing with the proper signature.

Thank You

Rollin Podwys